IN THE UNITED STATES DIS	TRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT	OF CALIFORNIA

SAN JOSE DIVISION

In re Juniper Networks, Inc. Securities NO. C 06-04327 JW Litigation NO. C 08-00246 JW

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS'
MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE CASES;
VACATING CASE MANAGEMENT
CONFERENCES

Presently before the Court is Defendants' Motion to Consolidate Related Cases. (hereafter, "Motion," Docket Item No. 144.) Defendants seek to consolidate In re Juniper Networks, Inc.

Securities Litigation, Case No. C 06-04327 JW, with The New York City Employees' Retirement

System v. Lisa Berry, Case No. C 08-0246 JW. Plaintiffs in both actions have filed timely responses to Defendants' motion. (See Docket Item No. 146 in C 06-04327; Docket Item No. 39 in C 08-0246.)

Defendants contend that these cases should be consolidated because they involve common questions of law and fact. <u>See</u> Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a). Plaintiffs collectively contend that Defendants' motion is merely a tactical move to invoke a global stay of the <u>Juniper</u> action.

The Court finds that consolidation is inappropriate at this time. Consolidation of these actions would result in an automatic stay of discovery under the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act, because Defendant in the <u>Berry</u> action has filed a Motion to Dismiss. Given that the two

¹ 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(b)(3)(B).

1	actions were fried well over one year apart, and that Flaminis in the <u>Jumper</u> action have already
2	overcome a Motion to Dismiss, discovery in the <u>Juniper</u> action should proceed. Although
3	Defendants' contention that the two actions should be consolidated is not without merit, the Court
4	finds that consideration of this issue will be more appropriate following resolution of the Motion to
5	Dismiss in the related <u>Berry</u> action. To consolidate these actions now would be unduly prejudicial
6	to Plaintiffs, who are ready to commence discovery in the Juniper action, having survived a Motion
7	to Dismiss in March, 2008. (See Docket Item No. 133.)
8	Accordingly, the Court DENIES Defendants' Motion to Consolidate without prejudice,

Accordingly, the Court DENIES Defendants' Motion to Consolidate without prejudice, giving Defendants' leave to renew this Motion pending resolution of the Motion to Dismiss in the Berry action.

In light of this Order, the Court VACATES the Case Management Conferences presently scheduled for October 6, 2008 for both cases.

With respect to the <u>Juniper</u> action, the Court refers the parties to the assigned Magistrate Judge, Judge Trumbull, to meet and confer and to develop a good faith discovery plan. The parties shall contact Judge Trumbull's Chambers within ten (10) days from the date of this Order to schedule their conference. Within ten (10) days following the parties' conference with Judge Trumbull, the parties shall file a Stipulated Discovery Plan for the Court's approval, including a proposed date for the close of all discovery.

With respect to the <u>Berry</u> action, since Defendant has filed and noticed her Motion to Dismiss for January 12, 2009, the Court will set a new conference date in its Order addressing that motion.

23 Dated: October 1, 2008

United States District Judge

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT COPIES OF THIS ORDER HAVE BEEN DELIVERED TO:

James Neil Kramer jkramer@orrick.com 4 Jason T. Baker jbaker@alexanderlaw.com 5 Jonathan Acker Shapiro jonathan.shapiro@wilmerhale.com Joni L. Ostler jostler@wsgr.com Joseph M. Barton jmb@gbcslaw.com 6 Mark Cotten Molumphy mmolumphy@cpmlegal.com 7 Melinda Haag mhaag@orrick.com Michael M. Goldberg info@glancylaw.com 8 Mozhgan Saniefar msaniefar@orrick.com Patrice L. Bishop service@ssbla.com Patrick Edward Gibbs patrick.gibbs@lw.com 9 Peter Allen Wald peter.wald@lw.com Peter Arthur Binkow info@glancylaw.com 10 Rebecca Felice Lubens rlubens@orrick.com Reed R. Kathrein reed@hbsslaw.com 11 United States District Court Richard Bemporad rbemporad@lowey.com 12 Richard W. Cohen rcohen@lowey.com For the Northern District of California Robert C. Schubert rschubert@schubertlawfirm.com Steven Guggenheim sguggenheim@wsgr.com 13 Viviann C Stapp viviann.stapp@lw.com Willem F. Jonckheer wjonckheer@schubert-reed.com 14 William M. Audet waudet@audetlaw.com 15 16 Dated: October 1, 2008 Richard W. Wieking, Clerk 17 18 /s/ JW Chambers By: Elizabeth Garcia 19 **Courtroom Deputy** 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

Alfred Glenn Yates yateslaw@aol.com Barbara J. Hart bhart@lowey.com

David C. Harrison dharrison@ldbs.com

David Michael Friedman david.friedman@lw.com

1

2

3

27

28